

for veterans, and then we are going to pass it, and we are going to leave town, and we are going to jam the Senate.”

And most of the House Republicans jumped to their feet and were giving him a standing ovation because the Speaker just told us we were going to jam the Senate, even though, according to what Senator MCCONNELL told another Kentuckian, he and Boehner had a deal worked out. But it got Speaker Boehner a standing ovation and big loud cheers, not from my friend, Representative MASSIE, and myself because we knew what the truth was.

But, anyway, some people, I hear, miss those days where he was Speaker and did things like that, or totally missed an opportunity on Cut, Cap, and Balance Act. Speaker Boehner said that could never pass the House of Representatives. We assured him it could, and it would if he would just bring it to the floor.

So Speaker Boehner finally agreed, and he brought it to the floor, and it passed and it was a huge victory, a huge day. But by that very afternoon, he was already talking about scrapping that and working a deal with the Senate. In other words, he had no intention of carrying out the will of the House as we had just passed it, which would have been great for lowering the indebtedness and getting America on a financially secure path. He was already scrapping the big victory we had before it even had a chance to be discussed in the Senate.

□ 1415

So I know there is some that miss those days, but if God grants us the chance to be in the majority again, we can't go back to those days of manipulation. We have got to be straightforward with the American people. We have got to have leaders that will do that. And we have got to be about the business of turning this country back to where freedom is the watchword for the day, not government oppression, not government putting businesses out of business, but letting freedom reign for real once again.

Madam Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

A SYMBOL OF NATIONAL CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise.

I rise to call to the attention of our Nation a symbol of national shame. And I rise to give commentary as I read a letter that I intend to send to certain colleagues. This is not a letter that I enjoyed producing, that I en-

joyed writing, but it is necessary, in my opinion, to call to the attention of my colleagues a symbol of national shame, the Russell Senate Office Building.

This building is right here on the campus in Washington, D.C. It is a building with the name of a person who should not be honored in such a way. It reads—and for our purposes today, I will simply say, “Dear Colleague.”

It is with love of country above politics that I send this request to remove the name of the racist Democrat—commentary: I will be saying some things about Democrats today because this involves Democrats—remove the name of the racist Democrat, Richard Russell, from the Senate office building named in his honor and revert to using the building's original name, the Old Senate Office Building until the Senate selects another nominee who will be honored.

The letter goes on to say:

In 1972, the Old Senate Office was renamed the Russell Senate Office Building, hence for 49 years, the Old Senate Office Building has been a symbol of national shame bearing the name of an unapologetic white supremacist.

Richard Brevard Russell, Jr., was a segregationist who worked throughout his career to disenfranchise and dehumanize people of color in our country, especially Black Americans.

He participated in his first filibuster of a civil rights bill in 1935. And in 1937, he was a part of the filibuster against antilynching legislation. In his 1936 reelection campaign, Russell committed himself to preserving and ensuring white supremacy in the social and economic, as well as the political life of our Nation. He also blocked the passage of a 1942 bill to eliminate poll taxes, and stated:

If progressives want to force social equality and commingling of races in the South, I can tell you now that you are doomed to failure.

In 1956, Russell coauthored the “Southern Manifesto” with Senator Strom Thurmond in opposition to integration of public schools after the Supreme Court unanimously ordered it in *Brown v. The Board of Education*.

In 1964, during a civil rights movement, he proposed a voluntary relocation program, a racial relocation program to adjust the imbalance of the African-American population between the 11 States of the old Confederacy and the rest of the Union.

My dear friends, this causes me to reflect upon the Trail of Tears. The Trail of Tears, quite similar but not nearly the same as what happened. The Trail of Tears was from 1938 to 1939, when the Cherokee Nation was forced to give up its land east of the Mississippi and to move to an area that we now know as Oklahoma. Thousands died. Thousands. Many others suffered; they cried. It was a trail of tears.

I suppose this was then-Senator Russell's contemporary version of what could have been a Trail of Tears for Af-

rican Americans. What a shame and sinful thing to propose that people simply be relocated because you have the power to do it, not because it was the right thing to do, not because it was a thing that would be done with some degree of honor and dignity. It was done because he had the power and he had a racist mentality, Democrat Senator Richard Russell.

That same year, Russell and 17 fellow Democrats—all senators—along with one Republican—let me pause for just a moment. Some things will bear repeating. I will repeat that. But I know that there seems to be this unwritten rule that you don't say negative things about Democrats if you are a Democrat. But there is a higher calling, and we all have to speak the truth about injustice and that trumps any of these rules related to politics. You have to put country above politics, and the people within the country should be always placed in a position such that justice will prevail.

So I will read again: That same year, Russell and 17 fellow Democratic senators, along with one Republican, led the 60-day filibuster against the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I don't care what party they were in; it was wrong.

When this filibuster failed and President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 into law, Russell, a Democrat, led a southern boycott of the 1964 Democratic National Convention as an act of rebellion. He was wrong then and it is wrong now.

Regrettably, dear friends, our Nation's history is stained with the bigotry of men like Russell. And although racism still dwells in our country, we do not have to honor it, and that is what we are doing with the Russell Senate Office Building. We are honoring bigotry and racism. We are honoring, in a sense, the anti-Semitism and the hate and the bigotry that he espoused and was proud to do so. He never repented. He never atoned. And taxpayer dollars are being used to maintain this facility, the Russell Senate Office Building.

Friends, by reverting the name of the Russell Senate Office Building back to the Old Senate Office Building, we are given the opportunity to atone for honoring this bigotry for 49 years, as well as we are given the opportunity to honor someone worthy of having a Senate office building named in their honor. This would be the appropriate thing to do.

And by the way, I, in no way, advise that a certain name should be utilized. I simply say remove the name of Russell, and after removing the name of Russell, let it revert to the name that it had, the Old Senate Office Building. And in so doing, the Senate has time to select a new nominee, another person to be honored.

No building maintained with taxpayer dollars should bear the name of Richard Brevard Russell, Jr.

To this end—and it actually reads “therefore”—I will introduce a resolution calling on the Senate to remove

the shameful name of Richard Brevard Russell, Jr., from the taxpayer-maintained Senate office building bearing his name. And I am going to request serious consideration of this resolution in the 117th Congress.

But that is not all that I plan to do. I shall not go into great detail about the rest of what I intend to do, but I will say this: When I go over next to the building, I will go over there to stand in the area where there is a statue of Richard Russell, Senator Richard Russell, a statue. There is a rotunda. He is the prominent figure; there are no other statues in that rotunda. If you traverse the Capitol, you will find many statues but none, in my opinion, honored to the extent that Richard Russell is being honored. He has an area unto himself.

I am going to go there, and I am going to point out that this is the statue that we have to move. I am going to talk about it from the statue itself, and I am going to point out some things about the statue, because we can't tolerate this kind of legacy being perpetuated. It is time to end it. It is time to stop glorifying bigotry and hate with taxpayer dollars.

How can we insist on renaming military bases that bear the names of racist Confederate generals and others, or military people, and then have an office building that we traverse on a daily basis that we are in and out of that is named after a racist and a bigot? How do we justify this?

We have the power—not the House—but the Senate has the power to change this. I will ask that the Senate change it, but I will also go over to the Senate. And I want to let the world see what's going on in that hallowed facility wherein we allow to occur what we desire to change—and what we are changing, in fact, in other facilities. It is time to change it.

Madam Speaker, I believe that this change should take place immediately. It has been 49 years. We have had enough time to consider it.

Madam Speaker, 49 years under various Presidents; 49 years Democrats in control, Republicans in control.

□ 1430

Some would say that we are just realizing how insidious this invidious behavior has been. Well, now that we know, we ought to move posthaste to change that which we could have changed many years ago.

I love my country. I have great respect for people who hold public trust. But I do believe that when we hold public trust, it is important for us to point out these kinds of circumstances that demean the reputation of the United States of America.

This symbol of national shame puts a stain on the notion that we believe in liberty and justice for all. It puts a stain on the notion that all persons are created equal, endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, among them, life, liberty, and the pursuit of

happiness. It puts a stain on the notion that we would speak to the world about their shortcomings but won't address one that the government has the power to change. It is shameful. This has to change.

Now, there are some who would want the change to take place, but they don't want it to appear as though someone has called this change to the attention of people and that they somehow will feel that it was done because it was called to the attention of the public.

Friends, when others speak out about injustices against other subsets of society, I have always been there to fight for that change, and I will continue to be there to fight for that change. It doesn't have to originate with me. If it is something that requires a righteous movement to make a positive change, I am going to be a part of that.

I am going to continue to support and fight for the rights of persons in all the various subsets of society who have been discriminated against. Just today, I was on the floor to fight for the rights of people who work in certain venues, who are being hurt, harmed, and some even die. That is my calling. That is why I was sent to Congress. I wasn't sent here to go along by trying to get along, not calling to the attention of my constituents and this country the changes that have to be made.

This is where I stand. This is where I will not retreat from. This is a position that means something to me and my constituents, and it ought to mean something to every person in this country.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for the time. I thank the leadership for the time. And I thank the people who have taken the time to hear these words. But there is much more to be said and much more to be done about a symbol of national shame.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION FAILURES CREATING BORDER CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, just prior to coming to Washington this week, I spent a couple of days down at the Mexican border to see for myself exactly what was going on down there.

I visited the El Paso sector. I would like to thank the Border Patrol, ICE, the ranchers, and local law enforcement for being so helpful and informative to the nine Congressmen who were in the El Paso sector over the weekend.

Our goal was to see over the last few months how things have changed, and in the last 5 months, things have changed dramatically at the border.

For one thing, illegal apprehensions are way up. In March, we had 172,000 il-

legal apprehensions, and that doesn't include, of course, the people who snuck across without being apprehended. This time last year, in March, there were 34,000 illegal apprehensions. What could cause an increase from 34,000 to 172,000?

It was painful not only to hear about the numbers but to see row after row of young children on mats just waiting for something to happen.

Now, what has happened? What happened at the border to get a fivefold increase in 1 year, as well as seeing all these children in almost inhumane conditions waiting to be taken away to somebody who they hope will take care of them?

First of all, this administration got rid of the migrant protection protocol. Donald Trump, I am sure in very difficult negotiations, had Mexico agree to hold people south of the border pending hearings for asylum. That was a huge benefit.

Secondly, we had agreements with Central American countries so that when people came here from other Central American countries or South America, they would be held south of the Mexican border.

Third, we changed things to the old-fashioned catch and release, where we touched people, but then when we are dealing with families, we let them in the United States pending a hearing on immigration. We changed title 42 to allow more people to come into this country, whether or not they have COVID.

Finally, we have a President who, during the campaign, made many different statements indicating that illegal immigration was not going to be a problem during his administration, whether he was promising free medical care, supporting sanctuary cities, ending the public charge rule. And President Trump had said: Immigrants coming here, we don't want you here if you are going to wind up on welfare.

It is no wonder they were wearing Biden T-shirts. We make stimulus payments to people who are here illegally.

Given all these changes, is it a surprise that so many people want to come here? In addition to the fact that the changes in the laws themselves cause people to get to the Mexican border to come here, it is advertising to the world that the United States does not care about immigration laws.

Now, we have to do something. We have dug ourselves a deeper hole in our relations with both El Salvador and Mexico. It is important to treat our Latin American cousins with respect. But in February, the President of El Salvador, President Bukele, was not given an audience when he showed up in this country in February. Is that the type of way we should treat our Central American allies when we want people held south of the border?

The Mexican President feels that President Biden has made himself out to be the migrant President. Mexico does not like this free-for-all at our